

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated December 10, 2009. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-15, and 18-25 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of U.S. Publication 2004/0008828 ("Coles"), U.S. Publication 2002/0038309 ("Perkins"), and U.S. Patent number 5,757,904 ("Anderson"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, respectfully asserting that cited combination does not disclose or suggest the claimed storing of an activity code in a database record describing a received call, *wherein said activity code is associated with one of a plurality of time periods occurring during said received call*, as in the present independent claims.

Coles discloses a system whose purpose is to assist an agent during a call by providing information to the agent during the call (see paragraph [0025]). Coles accomplishes this by monitoring a conversation to detect keywords, and automatically searching for information related to the call based on the detected keywords (see paragraph [0026]). The Coles system displays a keyword list and an information list to allow the agent user to manually select/deselect one or more of the detected keywords and/or retrieved information, in order to adjust the priority of the keywords and/or information. As keywords and/or information are selected/deselected by the agent user, the displayed keyword list and information list are dynamically updated based on new priorities and/or how much time has passed since a keyword was mentioned in the conversation (see Figs. 3-5, paragraphs [0030]-[0035]).

The keywords in Coles are stored with assigned weightings in a dictionary of keywords. The keywords recognized by the Coles system during the call are initially displayed in a list

reflecting the assigned to weights from the keyword dictionary. As the conversation proceeds, Coles the displayed list may be visually adjusted based on new keyword weightings reflecting agent selections of keywords in the list, the number of times individual keywords are matched, and the time periods between keyword matches detected during the call (e.g. paragraph [0035]). Thus, the Coles system assists the call agent during the call by displaying the keyword list, and by dynamically revising the displayed keyword list during the conversation without requiring direct input from the agent.

Perkins includes a Background section regarding Interaction Reports that states that desktop client applications have provided a mechanism by which an agent can associate wrap-up codes with an interaction, where the wrap-up codes indicate what a call was regarding (paragraph [0025]). Perkins then notes that reports must be generated based on wrap-up codes to illuminate patterns of call center interactions (paragraph [0026]). To conclude the Background section, Perkins states that problems with desktop client applications relate to lack of separation between business logic and computer telephony integration (CTI) logic, problems with deployment of client applications across multiple desktops, and resistance to change (paragraphs [0030]-[0036]). Perkins states the importance of capitalizing on opportunities, and that the desktop client may perform a very important function in a contact center by delivering information that an agent needs to service a customer at the exact moment of contact (paragraph [0037]). The remainder of Perkins goes on to describe a system integration framework that includes no further mention of wrap up codes.

Anderson also discloses that completed calls may be classified based on wrap-up codes. The system described in Anderson maintains records associated with customers (see column 7, lines 10-26, i.e. "Mr. Allen's record"). As shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 5, Anderson discloses that

wrap up codes describing a completed call are displayed and entered/selected by the agent during a wrap-up phase entered in response to completion of the call (lines 32-35 in column 7, see step 506 in Fig. 5).

Nowhere in the combination of Coles, Perkins and Anderson is there described or suggested a method for processing a received call, comprising:

- routing the received call to an agent;
- detecting a change of mode event prior to termination of said received call;
- responsive to said detecting said change of mode event, entering a muted command mode during which a caller of said call is prevented from hearing said agent speaking;
- receiving, during said muted command mode and prior to termination of said received call, at least one call description voice command from said agent; and
- storing at least one activity code associated with said at least one call description voice command in a data record associated with said received call in a database of call records associated with received calls, wherein said at least one activity code describes said received call, and wherein said activity code is associated with one of a plurality of time periods occurring during said received call.*** (emphasis added)

as for example in the present independent claim 1. Neither Coles, Perkins nor Anderson discloses or suggests dividing a received call into a plurality of time periods for purposes of associating activity codes with those time periods within the call, and accordingly the combination of Coles, Perkins and Anderson fails to disclose or suggest the claim limitation of *wherein said activity code is associated with one of a plurality of time periods occurring during said received call*, as in the present independent claims. In contrast, the combination of Coles, Perkins and Anderson results in a system in which an agent is provided with a keyword list and associated information during a call (as in Coles), and that stores wrap-up codes determined after a completed call for purposes of generating reports (as in Perkins and Anderson). The descriptions of wrap-up codes in Perkins and Anderson relate to codes describing a previously

completed call, and include no suggestion of even the desirability of associating a wrap-up code with one of a plurality of time periods within the completed call.

See in particular lines 46-51 in column 1 of Anderson (“At the conclusion of the call, it is up to the Agent to . . . select and indicate a work or “wrap-up” code for the call”). While the Examiner cites lines 41-54 in column 2 of Anderson, this section of that reference teaches generally that contextual assistance is provided to the agent with regard to selecting relevant wrap-up codes, while the specifics of such operation with regard to wrap-up codes are described in more detail with regard to step 316 in Fig. 3, and with regard to the steps shown in Fig. 5. The description of the steps in Fig. 5 provided in column 7 of Anderson indicate that the contextual assistance displayed to the agent by the Anderson system with regard to wrap-up codes is generated upon detecting completion of the call, and without any association with a specific time period occurring during the call.

The time periods measured between the detection of a given keyword in Coles are used for the purpose of dynamically calculating an updated weighting of the keyword for determining the keywords position in a list of keywords displayed to the agent during the call. Like Perkins and Anderson, Coles includes no teaching or suggestion associating a code with a time period within the call, and therefore also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed feature of *storing at least one activity code associated with said at least one call description voice command in a data record associated with said received call in a database of call records associated with received calls, wherein said at least one activity code describes said received call, and wherein said activity code is associated with one of a plurality of time periods occurring during said received call*, as for example in the present independent claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Coles, Perkins and Anderson does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims. The combination of Coles, Perkins and Anderson accordingly does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C 103 with regard to independent claims 1, 13 and 25. As to the remaining claims, they each depend from claims 1 and 13, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Coles, Perkins and Anderson for at least the same reasons.

For the above reasons Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections based on Coles, Perkins and Anderson be withdrawn.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicant's Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 9, 2010
Date

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 630-1131